



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/724,126	12/01/2003	Hongyong Zhang	0756-7224	1218
31780 7:	590 03/14/2006		EXAMINER	
ERIC ROBINSON			DEO, DUY VU NGUYEN	
PMB 955 21010 SOUTH	BANK ST.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
POTOMAC FALLS, VA 20165			1765	
			DATE MAIL ED: 02/14/200	,

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/724,126	ZHANG ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		DuyVu n. Deo	1765			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	CORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAMPS of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Or period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timused and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 Fe	ebruary 2006.				
•	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)	1					
٠,١	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4)⊠	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2 and 4-18</u> is/are pending in the application.					
•/==	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)[5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are rejected.					
7)	_					
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachmer	nt(s)					
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)			
. —	er No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	•			

Application/Control Number: 10/724,126 Page 2

Art Unit: 1765

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 2. Claims 4, 5, 8-18 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent No. 6,358,784. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they describe a method for doping a semiconductor substrate with a gas containing dopants and while moving the substrate.
- 3. Claims 1-18 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-24 of U.S. Patent No. 5,424,244. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they describe a method for doping a semiconductor substrate with the use of laser and electromagnetic energy.\

Response to Arguments

4. Referring to applicant's argument that claims 1-23 of Zhang '784 patent do not teach or suggest irradiating a semiconductor film with laser through a window having a slit shape while

Art Unit: 1765

transferring a substrate, independent claims in Zhang '784 describe irradiating the film while moving the substrate. This would read on claimed irradiating the film while transferring the substrate. Even though the claims do not suggest irradiating the laser through a window having a slit shape; however, this is an apparatus limitation, unless they affect the process in a manipulative sense, may have little weight in process claims. *In re Tarczy-Hornoch* 158, USPQ 141, 150 (CCPA 1968); *In re Edwards* 128 USPQ 387 (CCPA 1961); *Stalego V. Heymes* 120 USPA 473, 478 (CCPA 1959); *Ex parte Hart* 117 USPQ 193 (PO AdPatApp 1957); *In re Freeman* 44 USPQ 116 (CCPA 1940); *In re Sweeney* 72 USPQ 501 (CCPA 1947). Furthermore, it would be obvious at the time of the invention for one skilled in the art to use any available apparatus including claimed apparatus, which has a window with slit shape, for the laser irradiating process.

Referring to the limitation of using electromagnetic energy to produce a plasma is a well-known method to any skilled in the art at time of the invention. Therefore, it is obvious to use electromagnetic energy or any other type of energy as long as it can produce a plasma for the irradiating process.

Referring to applicant's argument that claims 1-24 of Zhang '244 patent doesn't describe the laser beam is a linear laser beam, claims 8 and 16 describe the laser beam is emitted from an excimer laser, which is also used by the applicant to produce the laser, therefore, the laser emitted described by Zhang would also produce a linear laser beam.

The 35 U.S.C 103(a) rejection of claims 1-3, 8-18 under Hoerschelmann and Arima is withdrawn since the claims have been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 3.

Application/Control Number: 10/724,126 Page 4

Art Unit: 1765

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DuyVu n. Deo whose telephone number is 571-272-1462.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on 571-272-1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/724,126 Page 5

Art Unit: 1765

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Primary Examiner Duy-Vu N. Deo 3/8/06

.